

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has objected to Figure 5b in the Drawings, and has suggested that the line representing reference number 30b should be extended to touch the auxiliary display. In response, Applicant has amended Figure 5b herein, such that the line indicating reference number 30b extends to touch the auxiliary display. It is believed that this amendment cures the Examiner's objection to the drawings. Accordingly, withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for a lack of written description in the Specification with respect to the "slip dialog" recitation in Claim 3, and the computer program set forth in Claim 7. As to the rejection of Claim 3, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's allegation that the specification does not describe what the slip dialog is or how it is enabled. Particularly, page 5, lines 14-17 of the Specification state that the slip dialog component realizes the variable auxiliary display area, and describe the slip dialog as an expanded dialog component including a command bar, which is opened upward. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, the slip dialog component is clearly defined in the Specification. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the M.P.E.P. requires that the meaning of every term in a claim should be apparent from the prior art or from the specification and the drawings at the time the application is filed. Moreover, so long as Applicants make clear and precise the terms used to define the invention, they are not confined to the terminology used in the prior art. In the present case, both the Specification *and* the Drawings make the meaning of the term in question apparent. The Specification clearly defines the slip dialog component (an expanded dialog component, used to realize the variable auxiliary display area), and states how it is enabled (it includes a command bar, which is opened upward). Furthermore, FIGs. 5(a) and 5(b) illustrate the expandable nature of the auxiliary display, which is realized by the slip dialog component. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal

of the §112, first paragraph rejection of Claim 3.

As to the §112, first paragraph rejection of Claim 7, Applicant has amended the claim by deleting “computer program device” and inserting --computer-readable recording medium-- therefor in line 1, and deleting “a program of” in line 2, as set forth below, to overcome the rejection. This amendment obviates the use of the term “program” in the claim, and tailors the claim to the third paragraph of page 3 of the Specification. It is believed that this amendment cures the Examiner’s §112, first paragraph rejection of Claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of the same, and the §112, first paragraph rejection altogether, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hayashida et al.* (US 2004/0198457) (hereinafter *Hayashida*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,620 to *Hansson*, and *Luo* (US 2003/0144024). In response, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 4 and 7, and respectfully asserts that the amendment overcomes the rejection. Specifically, *Hayashida* does not disclose a mobile terminal comprising a state display, a main display, and an auxiliary display overlapping the main display, in the fashion of the amended claims and shown in FIGs. 5(a) and 5(b) of the present specification. In fact, the main display is separate from the sub-display in *Hayashida*, and the two displays never overlap. Neither *Hansson* nor *Luo* make up for this deficiency in *Hayashida*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner’s §103(a) rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 4-7.

Independent Claims 1, 4 and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-7, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/RCC/dr